(98, 98%) **Connectivity to the Site**
(50, 50%) **Internal Wiring**
(56, 56%) **Routers and Servers**
(25, 25%) **User Access Devices (Computers)**
(70, 70%) **Ongoing Upgrades of Telecommunications Capabilities**
(56, 56%) **Technical Support**
(40, 40%) **Staff Training**
(30, 30%) **Assessment of Educational Value**

Read additional comments from survey forms or
Return to Universal Service/Network Democracy

Comments on Survey: Scope of Universal Service

- Question #1 seems oversimplified. My response is "public right" because "equity" implies the same rates – e.g. a school paying same rates as a commercial site; which is clearly not the intent of the Act. I'm not all that comfortable with "public right" however, since it could be taken as "every member of the public" when I choose to interpret it as meaning special consideration for certain public institutions (schools, libraries)

- Add Internet services to the list in 4. above.

  By Internet services, I mean Network Operations support (troubleshooting, config maintenance) -- those services that an ISP commonly provides. Also included: DNS and e-mail account services, WWW server services

- As I indicated in a prior message, I believe that we should narrow the scope of the services to focus on achieving 100% funding of all inter-district telecom costs, rather then a partial subsidy of all related service

- 1. Purpose of US – a bone thrown to Democrats so that the Republicans could pass a Telecommunications bill that favors large corporations, provides a virtually unworkable and unmanageable benefit for schools and libraries and is paid for by a hidden tax on the middle class.

  2. Educational needs: Depends on whether the benefactor is a school or library and what type of school or library it is. Also depends on the success of the school: e.g. the Internet is of zero value for someone who can't read. Also depends on the curriculum of the school: e.g. curriculum that requires research than can only be accomplished via the Internet would certainly have different needs than a school that requires research that can be accomplished in other ways; simply teaching someone how to use the Internet doesn't require much band width nor hardware. Depends on supporting services offered by community colleges, partnered universities and ISDs: e.g. if an ATM link offering ITV to/from a community college gives a high school the option of offering foreign languages they wouldn't otherwise be able to offer, then I would think my spending priority would be for this service rather than Internet and other types of telecommunication services.

  3. Range etc. IMHO the whole US concept (reduced telco rates for schools and libraries) should be scraped. If the Federal Government is going to provide direct aid to schools and libraries, they should setup a tax to support the aid and require schools and libraries to apply for the aid via the grant process. As to the range of services offered: that would depend on the number of institutions applying, and for what, and the availability of funds, and the technology of the day , and of course on the whimsy of the Federal bureaucrats who administer the fund and the

politicians who want to tinker with it.

4. Covered services: see 2 above.

5. Should the Federal Government be funding local schools and libraries? Probably not. IMHO not all, but nearly all communities have the resources to adequately support their schools and libraries, but choose not to. It would require greater local taxes to do so. When schools and libraries make a good case for additional funding, it is my experience that local communities often/usually find a way to support the request. When schools and libraries don't make the case, they apply for State and Federal grants or start lobying for legislation that provides what their local communities refuse to provide.

6. Should the Federal government be expanding the Internet infrastructure to rural areas and people with low incomes? A better question might be, should the Federal government circumvent what thousands of small entrepreneurs are already doing or trying to do? The unregulated ISP world is a competitive one that allows mom and pop operations. If you don't like the Internet services you are receiving, just be patient for awhile; some enterprising entrepreneur will provide you and the library and the school district with exactly what you need at a very competitive rate, probably a better rate than any telco will provide with or without rate subsidies.

- Educational institutions will be left behind if not helped. Schools located in wealthy areas have the ability to successfully raise funds so their children will get the best technology/telecommunications. Then it becomes an equity issue. Schools such as the ones in Hawthorne are left to constantly look for funds by writing grants and using the business "hand-me-downs." The "hand-me-down" equipment seldom can run the newer software. I tried to use some as a user device for Internet...wrong again... not enough memory and other things. Our District has a Long Range Technology Plan and we have met some of the items on the timeline. Just having computers means up grading the building electricity. Now with Internet we are looking at more infrastructure work. The knowledge needed to keep up is unbelievable.

  Our District needs help. We are four track year round, multicultural, multilingual, multiethenic. Some schools have over 70% AFDC, over 50% Title I, and a District average transiency rate of 10% per month. I often worry of how these kids will be ready for the work place if we teach them well but don't train them well.

- Maintain flexibility in defining services. Given the way technology changes and laws do not, limit the legalese as much as possible

- Tempting though it is to ask for the moon, I believe we must be realistic in determining the proper role of the FCC and the equally important roles of school districts, libraries, and communities in bringing about equity of access.

- A good way to get us all involved without the intimidation factor. The first plunge

in, especially for neophytes is a risk.

Good job, you are definitely to be commended

- As a representative of an underfunded rural school district, we consistantly face not only the bottom line, but a conservative structure which views change as consistantly negative. Our school board and much of our administration needs to be led into the 20th century, let alone the 21st. Universal service in order to be effectively implemented can not be simply mandated from above. It will require explanation and guidance for those who have been left behind

- Question #1: The equity of access answer needs some more detail. Equity of access does not mean the same access. Different schools will need different access. The T.A. should provide what schools need

- I did not answer question #1. Equity of access and Public right to access are difficult to determine. Are we to provide access for every tom dick and harry along with mary, suzy, and jane. They already have a right to that access. They have to pay for it just like everybody else does right now.

- I do not see internal equipment costs as a major burden, but connection and line costs are. We can not raise our prices to relect the needed improvement to our telecommunications capability to service our community in the manner they want. Right now, we have just three telephone lines servicing our high school with 45 teachers. It would be prohibitively expensive to provide them with the telecommunications access we know that they need right now

- Broad band services should be limited to connectivity. Yes there are many other issues (training, wiring, hardware, etc) but these should (must) remain the responsibility of the local site.

- First, my "votes" do not necessarily reflect the opinions or positions of my employer. Second, especially related to #4, a good case can certainly be made for funding staff training, technical support and other critical functions (and I reserve the right to be swayed and later change my vote), but it's important to remember that the overall and all-encompassing costs of bringing telecommunications technology to schools and libraries will be shared, at least to one degree or another. The equation--which fund or source pays for which services and infrastructure/hardware--is at the heart of the discussion for much of this seminar. This issue had to be addressed in Michigan a couple of years ago as part of an excess earnings case of Ameritech that was decided by the MI Public Service Commission (my previous employer). In short, the excess earnings were authorized for "networking" expenditures such as servers, routers and related equipment to connect a school district to a regional network, for example. However, it was not acceptable for expenditures to be made for classroom equipment, internal wiring or staff training. The theory was that other funding sources would have to cover those costs, including some rebudgeting by the schools themselves, that without the infrastructure establishing a network to the district's door there would be little

need for staff training, etc. This approach recognized "the big picture," but it realized that a one–time availability of $10.5 million in excess earnings could not begin to meet all needs related to technology. I believe this national debate on Universal Service runs somewhat parallel, though the final outcome and formula for disbursing dollars may be different

- Educating the teachers and students to use the new technologies should be first.

- I do not favor either smaller discounts or a larger fund. I favor a competitive procedure which will use the fund aas a method of incenting telecommunications providers to use innovation and efficiencies to reduce their costs. These reductions in costs should provide large educational discounts over the entire spectrum of telecommunications services required by the schools.

- The mission of my organization is "To assure Abilene's place on the Information Superhighway." a broader focus than that of this Universal Service / Network Democracy Seminar. The larger school district in my arena "recognizes the need to prepare every student to meet the technological challenges of the future with confidence and competence."

  I am not yet convinced that the special 'universal service' to schools, libraries, and medical–hospital services, is properly a part of the Universal Service to all citizens contemplated by the Telcom Act.

  These seem to be unrelated programs. There is still much confusion due to the way the Legislature assembled the Act; with several subcommittees, each developing a unique set of sections. There is *not* a sense of unity of thought and purpose.

  Telephony is separate from Video (Cable) and each is separate from data; wireless services are diverse and totally different, but similar. Packet service is *not* the same as dial–up; even if packets can be delivered over dial–up connections.

  Almost as an afterthought, the act requires that each *must* treat the other as if they were treating themselves. "A level playing field" (?) For elements as compatible as earth, wind, water & fire!??

  The existing (prior to the Act) Universal Service fund is aimed at leveling the cost to the provider for the infrastructure needed to reach the remote (rural) user of services identical to those offered to the highly dense population center user.

  The school, library support seems more nearly like the measured line offered to the 'widow without support' type of special rate for telephony. Not the same breed of cats.

  Let us all be particularly alert to the 'technical amendments' that will be offered by the Congressional leadership in the next session. These may be passed with little debate or discussion.

The question was asked earlier in the seminar; "What is the source of these funds?" I seem to have missed the answer(s)

- Q1: Equity seems to me to be more of an issue for schools.

  Q1: Public Right is more of an issue for libraries.

  Q2: Eventually all of these services will be on internet. (local voice may be an exception)

  Q4: Why should a telco pay for a LAN? (its not even their technology!

- I have a difficult time selecting between "equity" and "public right" in question 1. I feel it is a combination of the two so I would like to get a better definition of "public right" I could not find a reference in the discussion so far. I would want to make sure that connectivity to the site is open to a multitude of options, not just low-end services. Schools should be able to choose what works best based on the assessment of need and communication requirements

- I am afraid that because of hurricane Fran, I have not been able to keep up with the conversations of the seminar. I do think that it is important for the those receiving universal access to buy into the plan. Therefore they should be will to provide the technical support, internal wiring, and staff development. They must realize that this is a new method of delivery of information and be willing to shift the dollars to make it conceivable. Some school districts have already bitten the bullet on this and should be commended.

- If telecommunications technology is to have a true impact on the instructional program, teacher training, access to equipment and technological support must be present. This provide an authentic opportunity for teachers to integrate technology into the curriculum. Students and teachers without this opportunity ortunity will begin to view their schools as second class institutions.

- Consider some kind of requirement on the local level to match Universal service - something like a "maintenance of effort" clause

- These questions talk to the issue of bona fide requests for whom and judged by whom and how are they funded. I strongly urge ANY request by a school district or eligible public agency to automatically be considered a bona fide request. This means the services should be broad in nature and the Universal Fund must be appropriately funded. In my opinion any other approach will have little impact on the apparant goals of the program.

- The services listed under item 4 all are important components of achieving access and effective utilization of telecommunications, however, it must be understood that only certain components can be expected to be funded through the Telecommunications Act. Individual schools and communities must assume responsibility for supporting training, computers and evaluation. Perhaps this

forum will allow for a group discussion of how schools and communities can allocate resources for these expenses.

Thanks for including evaluation in the discussion. We can learn a great deal from experiences of those further down the path

- The new technologies are replacing the traditional methods of information access. The government depository program, government printing program, health information, consumer information--all are moving toward electronic distribution. For the sake of our democracy, we need to make sure information is available to all. The Universal Service provision can ensure that all our people have access, regardless of race, creed, level of income, etc. Thank you for listening!

- Cost continues to be a barrier to access. Large access cost discrepencies exist between rural and urban. There needs to be a model to equalize access and make sustainable.

- I found myself answering "both" or "all of the above" to many of these questions. I think "Universal Acess" means exactly what it says; it's not a matter of equity it's a matter of rights. Just like education and libraries–as citizens we have the right to education and to information

- Among other considerations business should recognize that its future involves graduating much more sophisticated and knowledgeable students from our schools.

  It is in the best interest of business to help insure such a graduate by providing more than window dressing --sound byte programs that make the 6:00 News or the morning paper-- as ongoing investment in the future of American education.

  In sum, a working Universal Service Fund should not be looked on as a penalty for the gifts businesses have received under the 1996 Act. It should be looked upon as a way to improve the public need to know using the very best methods modern technology has to offer.

- The Maine PUC, through a rate case decision, is requiring NYNEX to fund a School and Library network in Maine (approx 1100 sites). While the fund provides some money for computers (rural sites with NO computer) and training, the bulk of the fund ($20million over 5 years) is being spent for connectivity. The sites that will gain the most from this network are those without the means to do so on their own. Any "universal service" funding mechanism should be targeted, using some sort of means test. The Universal Service fund now supports the phone service for anybody in an area of "high cost" to include someone on food stamps to Bill Gates. Hardly an efficient or equitable system. The cost–causers should pay and those who can't to receive some sort of support

- I feel that we should not expect too much from universal service, for much of what is required to effectively use technology should remain the responsibility of the

local entity. Where universal service kicks in is in making access to information affordable for all citizens and institutions serving them. In other words the costs of hooking up an institution to telecommunications and the provision of the line through which information flows should be discounted to the point that it is within the reach of every school and library. Other costs such as for routers, personal computers, staff training and the like should be separate from universal service

- Educational networking is in such an embryonic stage that far too few educators, administrators and decisionmakers have an adequate basis to make informed choices relative to the potential values and required accomodations the introduction of new communications services will represent for schools and libraries. We have to show the "why" before the "how" will make sense.

- Re: Broad vs. Narrow.

  Support should cover broad range of services so that schools and libraries have flexibility choosing the services that they need most.

- Unfortunately, the either/or options of this survey preclude the kind of flexibility which will be necessary when the states begin to implement the broad concepts which the FCC will establish in its rulemaking process. It may be better to have broad categories and definitions which are adaptable to state and local situations and needs for all of the potentials participant and beneficiaries of the Universal Service funding mechanisms.

- The public right of access to modern technologies is important. We also should consider the operating hours of schools, libraries and other public access points. Unfortunately, with the exception of Post Office lobbies and hospital emergency rooms, few public buildings are accessible weekends or during hours other than the typical 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. workday. The AARP and Consumers Union arguments for broad service, affordable service, and unmetered service to users' homes have much to recommend them. In reality, the Universal Service fund will be an investment in future returns for all the technologies which contribute to the fund. Each new user becomes part of the customer base, whether it is a school, a library, or a private home, which will continue to use and need further services far into the future.

- I want to be sure that advanced applications are covered in the universal service fund versus the standard phone service.

  Secondly, I would like to see all barriers for telecommunications service across regions eliminated. Let the competitive market drive discounts for schools rather than have the providers and PUC's set discount rates which may become inflexible and will maintain the current infrastructure.

- Re: equity vs. public right

  It seems to me that "equity" has the potential of putting a cap on access while

"public right" seems to imply a basic level of access without upper limits

- The survey seems tilted to one point of view -- guaranteeing responses by pointed wording of questions or limiting response choices. For example: Question #1 – Are these the only options? and, What really is the difference between the two? Question #3 – Where is the clarification question for those who respond "Narrow"

  Just some thoughts – am enjoying the discussion.

- My that was painless

- Public right access is fine if you go beyond "rights" to service. Too often the government agrees to an idea as essential and legislates it---------without any financial means to accomplish the idea. Nice ideas don't educate and neither do just having the "rights" issued

- Should the range of services covered by the Universal Service Fund be narrow, so that the magnitude of available discounts can be large, or should the range of services be broad, which would result either in smaller discounts or a larger Fund?

  I am not sure I am understanding this question completely. We must choose what the Universal Fund will cover...Broad range of services, which allows for smaller discounts to public entities? Or a more narrow range of services to offer larger discounts? If this is correct, I do not think limitations should be part of the arrangement! Technology is changing too quickly and if we limit our discount to services, we might well be limiting our capabilities for integration.

  Second point:

  How should we view the purpose of the Universal Service Fund for schools and libraries? Is it to provide equity of access to telecommunications services, or is it to establish a public right of access to such services?

  If we are JUST focusing on schools and libraries...the purpose of the Universal Fund is both equity of access because of the equity of information for educational purposes and thus the right of every student, teacher, administrator, and parent to have these services. There is a point I am not understanding here. Why is this being viewed as either equity or right? In my eyes equality of education is a right just as it is the right to have the opportunity of education according to the US Constitution

- For schools that have taken the initiative to provide access to the Internet for all students K–12 by finding ways to fund a 2.5 to 1 ratio of students to computers, by becoming a Website provider for the community, by providing a topography with a backbone of fiber (not only locally, but for satellite schools WAN), and by hiring a staff for teacher and equipment support---finding new funding is very difficult.

  It seems the attitude of most funding organizations is (for these schools) there are

more needy schools and since you have access you have no further need. We have access and advanced technology services BECAUSE we were aggressive in seeking outside grant funding and local funding. We organized our technology committees years ago and followed the strategic plan that was adopted. We successfully ran public relation campaigns focusing on the future for our children and how technology is going to play a critical part.

My frustration now is this:

1. The Wayne Community Schools has 340 networked computers offering 940 students email services, homework assignements at home, curriculum information for for parents, scheduling and grading services for all teachers and administrators, internet access for ALL students while at school or at home (free), 40 laptops to take home overnight and over the weekends, CUceeme activities, community access to internet, multimedia services via the network, video animation training in the television studio, industrial technology mods---etc.

BUT

To maintain this system requires a small school to invest about $110,000 a year--that is not dollars toward BUILDING the network services---only for MAINTENANCE of what we have.

Are there no dollars available for schools that have been aggressive and do provide the cutting edge? If these schools are not allowed to pursue their technology goals, won't they to end up in the same mediocrity of technolical services that the average schools offer to their students? Then, what have we gained?

- Some aspects of the connectivity should be local responsibility Updating workstations, ongoing training, software etc. are the responsibility of the organization providing services. The real monitary problems seem to be in starting up a new service and purchasing core equipment. The service costs for a school or a library should be discounted and lower than a commercial business that will probably make a profit for the use.

- I serve as a technology coordinator for a county with several small rural school districts. Their primary concern is access to digital data comm, i.e., frame relay, and the cost of that service at an acceptable bandwidth. Most of these districts already have the computers, and could probably afford routers. They either can not get frame relay, or it they can, they can not justify the cost of a frame relay connection at a band width that gives acceptable performance.

- Is there a recognized governing office that can certify an "Internet Education" teacher? I feel that I am qualified, but if someone questions my qualifications, I want to be able to prove myself. I would appreciate a reply.

Return to Analysis of the Survey or

Universal Service/Network Democracy Survey Form
Allocation of Universal Service Subsidies

Please supply the following information to identify yourself:

Name: (Last) (First)

E-mail:

Organization:

City: State:

Please answer each question by selecting one or more of the checkboxes provided or typing in requested information. If you answer "Other" to any of the questions given below, or if you have additional comments to make on these questions, please use the text box at the bottom of the form for your response.

1. **Mechanisms:** What mechanism should be used to provide Universal Service subsidies to schools and libraries?

Cash Grants
Vouchers
Discounts on selected services
E-rate (100% discount) for schools and libraries
Other

2. ***Bona Fide* Requests:** What minimal justifications should a school, library or school district be required to offer in support of requests for subsidized telecommunications services?

Request from Authorized Individual
State Approved Technology Plan
District Approved Technology Plan
Knowledge of Technology Options
Progress Toward Goals of Telecom Act
Provision of Matching Funds
Current Use of Network Resources
Educational Need
Need for Added Bandwidth

3. **Extent:** Should Universal Service subsidies extend to groups which provide educational materials or support for educational organizations, such as universities and colleges or community centers?

Yes
No

4. Equity: How can the Universal Service Fund insure equity of access for all schools and libraries?

Baseline subsidy
Per capita subsidies
Subsidies based upon population density
Subsidies based upon income
Other

Please elaborate on any of your responses to these questions as appropriate:

Thanks for participating!

Return to Universal Service/Network Democracy without completing the survey.

Analysis of Survey: Allocation of Universal Service Subsidies

---

Date: Oct. 2 - 11:10 AM
Number of Respondents: 53

1. Mechanisms: What mechanism should be used to provide Universal Service subsidies to schools and libraries?

(8, 15.38%) **Cash Grants**
(3, 5.769%) **Other**
(24, 46.15%) **E-rate (100% discount) for schools and libraries**
(3, 5.769%) **Vouchers**
(14, 26.92%) **Discounts on selected services**

2. *Bona Fide* Requests: What minimal justifications should a school, library or school district be required to offer in support of requests for subsidized telecommunications services?

(27, 50.94%) **Request from Authorized Individual**
(13, 24.52%) **State Approved Technology Plan**
(24, 45.28%) **District Approved Technology Plan**
(15, 28.30%) **Knowledge of Technology Options**
(13, 24.52%) **Progress Toward Goals of Telecom Act**
(11, 20.75%) **Provision of Matching Funds**
(10, 18.86%) **Current Use of Network Resources**
(27, 50.94%) **Educational Need**
(7, 13.20%) **Need for Added Bandwidth**

3. Extent: Should Universal Service subsidies extend to groups which provide educational materials or support for educational organizations, such as universities and colleges or community centers?

(31, 59.61%) **Yes**
(21, 40.38%) **No**

4. Equity: How can the Universal Service Fund insure equity of access for all schools and libraries?

(16, 30.18%) **Baseline subsidy**
(13, 24.52%) **Per capita subsidies**
(5, 9.433%) **Subsidies based upon population density**
(14, 26.41%) **Subsidies based upon income**
(15, 28.30%) **Other**

Return to Universal Service/Network Democracy

Comments on Survey: Allocation of Universal Service Subsidies

---

- Your educational systems extend for beyond the public School/Library arena. Day Care, Montesoori Schools, After Care. It obvious that our 17th Century educational system is in need of an overhaul. So to place the heap of focus on the status quo (Public Schools and Libraries) is irresponsive at best. Regional, community learning consortiums provide the best stop gap measure, while we creatively reshape the educational systems throughout this nation. partnerships between businesses, government, public and private sector are without question necessary. This one truth eclispes all others: These children are our future and our children! We owe them nothing less than the best and it is our responsiblity to provide it. Those in positions of wealth and influence provide for themselves and their familys, why shouldn't we be so moved.

- The planning process at the local level is key, for ensuring that options are considered, that community involvment exists from inception, that ongoing support needs are addressed. Approval of such plans by peer groups (as suggested in our discussions) is desired over state or district blessings, to lessen the bureaucratic burden, and place responsibility closer to the place where use of the subsidy will happen.

- I am not sure that equity of access can be assured under any plan.There will always be those who fall through the cracks of any plan or proposal. I think that any plan that is finally approved should be easy to understand and implement.

- #3 – This extension should be limited to non–profit organizations, public or private, which provide direct educational services in support of the K–12 population.

  #4 –The distribution formula used in awarding colleges and universities student financial aid funds might provide a useful model for designing an equitable distribution formula.

- Q1 Vouchers plus discounts

  Q2 Provision of matching funds (easily administered) perhaps an approved tech plan for over a $ threshold

  Q3 Not sure I understand implications of Q3

  Q4 Per Capita plus per public school and per public library perhaps modified by additional costs imposed by geography (for example, rugged terrain).

- I know some kind of needs based assessment is important, but I see districts such

as my own reluctant to declare themselves as needy and another paper producing project is the last thing we need.

- Whatever is setup must deal with the "haves-havenot" quandry. Should be some determination of available revenue in awarding grants to communities.

- 1. Mechanisms: What mechanism should be used to provide Universal Service subsidies to schools and libraries?

  "discount for selected" services is closest, but it has the possibility of being limited to what the telco wants to push. A more attractive notion would be to have an across the board method, whether it is a percentage, a cap, or an algorithm. An example of the latter might be to have the price be exclusieve of the marginal cost of the local loop, thus encouraging transmission efficiencies. If an "E-Rate" means 100% discount (I had not gathered this elsewhere), it is inappropriate, as there is no backpressure on pointless consumption.

  2. Bona Fide Requests: What minimal justifications should a school, library or school district be required to offer in support of requests for subsidized telecommunications services?

  Definitely from a legitimate officer of the org. The Org should also be able to demonstrate edcucational accredation (sp?) and not-for-profit status. A technology plan would be good, but only as a sign of commitment. Detailed review of such plans would probably produce an undue burden on the schools and states. The existence of a CURRICULUM plan for the use of the technology would also be desirable, but as in the technology plan, the fact of the plan is probably more important than its details or approval by bureaucrats.

  3. Higher Ed. (Sorry, "Post-Secondary Education" has its own ways of support, and should probably look elsewhere. Besides, if there is a collaboaration between a university and a school district, the district can order the services.

  4. Equity: How can the Universal Service Fund insure equity of access for all schools and libraries?

  Oooh. Whose standards? I can't imagine that any blanket policy would accomplish this end. There would clearly need to be some evaluation of what is available. One can imagine all sorts of crazy features and outright abuses for the options given (like deluxe facililties in the middle of nowhere) Is there such a thing as "outcomes-based" telecommunication evaulation?

- Rather general questions, and answer choices make it easy to miss key points. Will the funds be properly leveraged to benefit the intended beneficiaries? Often not. How can we all assure U.Service funds are optimally utilized? The evaluative metrics of what happens after funding is important to tie to possible future funding. If some non institutional entity can do a better job leveraging the public good from U.Service funds, perhaps they should be specifically encouraged to do so.

If competition is good for the marketplace, it should increase the attention toward excellence in educational institutions, too. Otherwise this is all just another turn at the trough/pork barrelism.

- 1. Universal fund subsidies should be allocated using the mechanism of a contract agency.This agency which should be directed by a group within each jurisdiction should use the subsidy to realize discounts through a competitive bidding process which stress innovation and efficiency. The fund should not be used to provide incumbent telcos with a revenue stream by subsidizing school discountsw on a dollar for dollar basis. Subsidies should be used to stimulate an RFP process where the broad range of services required by schools will be offered by a broad range of competitors.

  2. There should be two criteria to evaluate a "bona fide" reequest. First,th e request should be submitted by an educational institution certified as a k12 school in the state in which it operates. Second, the request should be for services based upon the total school principle. This principle is base upon the fact that the entire school or school district is dedicated to providing a genuine learning environment and there are no units within the school or the school district which is unessential to this effort.

  3. The issue of equity is tied to the overall question of whho should administer the fund. The current administrator, NECA, has served this function well in the past. Before all that was necessary was for the fund to be fairly allocated among the various carriers. Thus the carrier association was the appropriate administrator. Under the Act, the universal fund will serve other purposes. It would be inappropriate and a conflict of interest to allow the carriers to determine policies regarding fund allocations. The carriers want to retain as much of the fund as possible.There really is little choice other than establishing a neutral fund administrator which can balance the various claims made on the fund. The administrator should be guided by a broad based policy group which represents all interests concerned with the fund's administration.The principles for administering the fund must focused away from creating the fundamentals of a regulated monopoly towards implementing the principles of a competitive telecommmunications industry.

- To have equitable universal service, each educational entity must be supplied with access.

- Per capita subsidies come closest to funding for all the "other" technology to make universal service a possible outcome.

- 3. Universities, Community Colleges & State or County Library systems could serve important roles as trainers and disseminators of technology practices for the elementary and secondary school systems. Additionally, on–line resources of a University or County library system could facilitate student research at the elementary and secondary levels. One technology, the "jukebox" contains journals/periodicals on CD–Roms. A small charge ($.25) for printing covers the

royalties for the publishers, while the library is spared the costs involved w/maintaining periodical "stacks." Secondly, if a universal student record could be agreed upon, any school system could have instant access to important information about new students, rather than wait for the time–consuming process of mailing from district to district. An electronic record system, if it were interchangeable throughout our country, could speed the process of college applications and reduce the volume of paper records that need to be stored by colleges and universities.

4. The remote, expensive to serve areas, must be addressed separately by the entire universal service industry. No one provider can afford to serve them.

- Equity must look at equal access regardless of traditional measures of wealth or capability. All learners must have equal opportunity.

  Equity may require using a compination of all 4 equity funding ideas above and more.

  Wealthy and populated areas with strong information systems will add to the Universal fund as more users purchase lines and all to access it. Their community should not be excluded inour thinking as they will add more funds than they use. Rural areas may need a little more as infrastructure may need to be added.

- I am reviewing state telcom grants as I write. Part of the problem with equity occurs because rural America is less populated AND it costs more to wire large distances. Neither of these are surprising. Yet, none of the equity choices above address this (unless Pop density is meant to help rural America).

  We are without ISDN capabilities. It is not even scheduled for our area (GTE). A grant I just reviewed can only receive 56k connections and it will cost them $7,000 per year. (Not GTE)

  They would be smarter to use 28.8 modems but it effectively limits the speed and access potential.

  These issues are important and must be addressed.

- Equity:

  Provide connectivity and e–rate (100% discount) to all schools and libraries.

Return to Analysis of the Survey or
Return to Universal Service / Network Democracy

Universal Service/Network Democracy
Survey Form
Conclusion of the On-line Seminar

Please supply the following information to identify yourself:

Name: (Last) (First)

E-mail:

Organization:

City: **State:**

Please answer each question by selecting one or more of the checkboxes provided or typing in requested information.

1. CONTENT

1a. Topics: How would you describe the topics cover in the seminar?

- Valuable
- Relevant
- Too Broad to Cover
- Issues too Complex to Deal With

Other Comments and Suggestions on the Seminar Topics:

1b. On-line Materials: Which on-line materials did you find to be useful?

- Weekly Summaries
- Repository of Comments to the FCC
- Participants' Contributions (On-line Library)
- Useful Documents
- Archive of On-line Discussions

Other Comments and Suggestions on the On-line Materials

1c. Surveys: What was your opinion of the surveys?

- Useful Adjunct to On-line Discussion

Too Shallow to be of Great Value
Good Way to Assess Views of the Whole Group

Other Comments and Suggestions on the Surveys

2. MECHANICS

2a. Organization: How did you regard the organization of the seminar?

Too loose
Too strict
Just right

2b. Moderation: The seminar's mailing list was set up as a moderated list, with the moderator reviewing all traffic and adding occasional editorial comments. How did you regard this aspect of the seminar?

Too constraining
Too open
Just right

2c. Duration: The seminar took place in a five week period. How would you describe this scheduling?

Too long
Not long enough
Just right

2d. Time required: How would you characterize the time required for you to participate in the seminar?

Not much
Reasonable
Excessive, but necessary
Too much

2e. Access: The seminar was organized so that material would be accessed through a combination of e-mail and the World Wide Web. How did you access this material?

E-mail only
Web only
E-mail and Web

Please add other observations you might have on the mechanics of the seminar.

3. VALUE

3a. Achievement: Have you achieved what you hoped to accomplish in the seminar?

Yes
No
Partially
More than expected

3b. Interactions: Have you interacted privately with other people registered for the seminar?

Yes
No
No, but I expect to do so in the future

3c. Participation: Have you written to the FCC or other public officials in relation to the Telecommunications Act of 1996?

Yes
No
No, but I expect to do so in the future

3d. Recommendations: Would you recommend this type of seminar to other people in future?

Yes
No
Yes, and I would like to participate again myself

Please add any other comments you have on the value of the seminar, on how you intend to use the information you gained here, and on whether you think that there should be similar activities in the future.

Thanks for participating!

Return to Universal Service/Network Democracy without completing the survey.

Analysis of Survey: Conclusion of the On-line Seminar

Date: Oct. 25 - 05:36 PM
Number of Respondents: 134

1a. Topics: How would you describe the topics cover in the seminar?

(61, 45.52%) **Valuable**
(79, 58.95%) **Relevant**
(25, 18.65%) **Too Broad to Cover**
(18, 13.43%) **Issues too Complex to Deal With**

1b. On-line Materials: Which on-line materials did you find to be useful?

(90, 67.16%) **Weekly Summaries**
(45, 33.58%) **Repository of Comments to the FCC**
(65, 48.50%) **Participants' Contributions (On-line Library)**
(45, 33.58%) **Useful Documents**
(34, 25.37%) **Archive of On-line Discussions**

1c. Surveys: What was your opinion of the surveys?

(45, 33.58%) **Useful Adjunct to On-line Discussion**
(17, 12.68%) **Too Shallow to be of Great Value**
(62, 46.26%) **Good Way to Assess Views of the Whole Group**

2a. Organization: How did you regard the organization of the seminar?

(88, 72.13%) **Just right**
(32, 26.22%) **Too loose**
(2, 1.639%) **Too strict**

2b. Moderation: The seminar's mailing list was set up as a moderated list, with the moderator reviewing all traffic and adding occasional editorial comments. How did you regard this aspect of the seminar?

(15, 12.71%) **Too open**
(100, 84.74%) **Just right**
(3, 2.542%) **Too constraining**

2c. Duration: The seminar took place in a five week period. How would you describe this scheduling?

(60, 49.18%) **Just right**
(28, 22.95%) **Not long enough**
(34, 27.86%) **Too long**

2d. Time required: How would you characterize the time required for you to participate in the seminar?

(44, 34.92%) **Excessive, but necessary**

(7, 5.555%) **Not much**

(47, 37.30%) **Reasonable**

(28, 22.22%) **Too much**

2e. Access: The seminar was organized so that material would be accessed through a combination of e-mail and the World Wide Web. How did you access this material?

(87, 68.50%) **E-mail and Web**

(18, 14.17%) **Web only**

(22, 17.32%) **E-mail only**

3a. Achievement: Have you achieved what you hoped to accomplish in the seminar?

(78, 60.93%) **Partially**

(20, 15.62%) **Yes**

(15, 11.71%) **More than expected**

(15, 11.71%) **No**

3b. Interactions: Have you interacted privately with other people registered for the seminar?

(45, 34.61%) **Yes**

(59, 45.38%) **No**

(26, 20%) **No, but I expect to do so in the future**

3c. Participation: Have you written to the FCC or other public officials in relation to the Telecommunications Act of 1996?

(48, 36.92%) **Yes**

(59, 45.38%) **No**

(23, 17.69%) **No, but I expect to do so in the future**

3d. Recommendations: Would you recommend this type of seminar to other people in future?

(54, 44.26%) **Yes, and I would like to participate again myself**

(62, 50.81%) **Yes**

(6, 4.918%) **No**

Return to Universal Service/Network Democracy

Comments on Survey:
Conclusion of the On-line Seminar

Other Comments and Suggestions on the Seminar Topics

- Although the topics are all important, I appreciated the moderator bringing focus to the discussion in the last few weeks. It was pretty much all over the map at first with a seeming desire to have the FCC solve ALL our problems.

- The on line conference worked just as our last two years have worked we mixed philosophy, put our fires, mixed curriculum and technology, law and needs. Some of us were knowledgable about bits and pieces but no one could handle the deversity and enormity of the project. Thanks to Bob and your crew, I hope you don't think it a cop out to check "all of the above".

- Some of the technical details involving connectivity are beyond the grasp of some participants and hence make intelligent commenting difficult.

- In a future seminar, I would have more time to study the complex technologies and funding issues if there were less postings to the list by certain verbose participants. Then, _I'd_ contribute comments more regularly to the list.

  Please enforce a one posting per week per participant rule.

- The seminar began too late in the FCC proceedings to be credible as an influence on the considerations. The late start also made it virtually impossible for newcomers to catch up with and understand the volume of material, the issues and the tactics of the advocates.

- Checking all four options may make it sound like I'm critical of the seminar. Not true. I just think that to reach consensus, come up with solutions (or good ideas that may lead to solutions), etc., it would be difficult to accomplish in an electronic forum, especially with a topic as broad and complicated as Universal Service.

- I learned a lot, but I was overwhelmed.

- It appeared to me that seminar participants got "bogged down" in the paradigm of a "listserv" discussion rather than in a true seminar format. It was difficult for members to keep focused and on task.

- Overall this was a great effort. I feel many key points regarding key issues were assumed and/or generalized. I recommend a tighter focus. For instance; if flat rate internet is broadly available for $20/month in most communities, and if Eugene, OR is able to bring this access cost down to a sustainable $5/month for unlimited access...what's the brouha about universal service? Is this a bandwidth question? Again: Focused issues make better sense.

- My orientation is engineering. The Seminar is policy/sociology/philosophy oriented. I prefer questions that are answered more unequivocally. These all have a "yes, but" or "only if" connected to the answer. The source material that I read included comments from providers that were still in a mind-set of telephony, or TV Cable, or wireless, instead of telecommunications. The Act seems to have been written in such a way as to encourage that kind of confusion. The stakeholders (legacy providers) are obliged to try to maintain as much of the status quo as they can to help amortize the 'stranded investments' and reassure their stockholders. Yet they must face competition without the burden of that once prudent investment. I particularly noticed that the Universal Access fund borrows from Peter to pay Paul. TANSTAAFL! (Which betrays my age.) English needs another synonym for Universal, besides Ubiquitous since these are embroiled in legaleze. I believe Information Superhighway access must be equally available to (potential) users, regardless of race, creed, age, education, gender, or economic status. Yet it cannot be free, for only the worthless has no price, no cost. The 'Universal Service' discussed in this seminar is actually service to a limited segment of the population, related to users in K-12 only.

- The issues are complex and the seminar helped to sort through the issues assisting in a clearer perspective and direction.

- Topics certainly covered many of the important issues although some of the discussions re: need for professional development registered participant frustrations, but weren't necessarily relevant to the questions posed by the F.C.C.

- Excellent approach to broad based input from a large body of constituents.

- It was a great experience to be part of this kind of conference and to learn more about computers in Education today.

- They seem to be in consensus with other groups doing similar discussions be they online, at conferences, or in local districts.

- I was out of my depth for major portions of the discussion.

- As we are a very small facility, and just beginning to build a network, the comments by most of the contributors were beyond us, however some of the